Soutovery

OSWEGO COUNTY COURT

COUNTY OF OSWEGO STATE OF NEW YORK

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ <u>INDICTMENT</u>#

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

10C-0138

- vs -

NYSID#

JAMES H. STEEN, JR.,

6026979R

Defendant.

SENTENCE

Public Safety Center 39 Churchill Road Oswego, New York 13126 June 23, 2011

Before:

HONORABLE WALTER W. HAFNER, JR.,

Judge

Appearances:

Oswego County District Attorney's Office Public Safety Center 39 Churchill Road Oswego, New York 13126 By: DONALD H. DODD, ESQ. District Attorney

JAMES R. McGRAW LAW OFFICE Attorneys for Defendant 333 East Onondaga Street Syracuse, New York 13202 By: ANNALEIGH PORTER, ESQ.

AMY L. FOX Court Clerk



Amy VanAlstyne Transcriber

OLERK'S OFFICE

THE CLERK: James H. Steen, Jr.. This is the matter of The People of the State of New York versus James H. Steen, Jr., Indictment #10C-0138. We're here today for sentencing. Would counsel please state their names for the record.

MS. PORTER: Annaleigh Porter for James Steen.

MR. DODD: Donald Dodd, Judge, District
Attorney's Office. Mr. Steen is physically present,
sir.

THE COURT: Yes. First issue to resolve is at least Channel 9 has asked to videotape the proceedings for broadcast at a later date.

Objection by counsel or anyone or --

MS. PORTER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Agreeable or --

MR. DODD: Apparently an objection by Defense Counsel.

THE COURT: All right. There's been objection by Defense Counsel so the proceedings cannot be taped.

Next issue, I guess, before we go to sentencing, Mr. Dodd, you had sent down a request for the Department of Social Services for restitution for burial expenses for Victoria Steen

and I see that figure differs from the figure of

Probation so let me see what they have and what you

21

22

23

24

25

have here as to why they're different possibly. Okay, Probation had Charles Carr and you have Victoria Steen so I guess we have to add the request by Department of Social Services for Victoria's burial expenses which are \$2,220 to the \$3,500 Charles Carr's family's request for burial expenses and I will have to put a total on here. So the total request for restitution on this is \$5,720 with the \$285 surcharge for a total of \$6,006. Mr. Steen has a right to have a hearing on that matter or if he's agreeable to the \$6,006 requested, the Court would order restitution in that sum to be paid by So that's the first issue. Mr. Steen. agreeable to the restitution as requested or is he requesting a hearing?

MS. PORTER: He is not requesting a hearing, your Honor. However, I make note that he does not have any assets in his name at this time.

THE COURT: I'll order the restitution and I'll recommend the Parole Board collect it from him so -- I mean, if he has assets and the Department of Corrections deems it appropriate or he obtains money in some fashion, it's my understanding they'll take

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those monies or a portion of them, at least, for purposes of satisfying the restitution obligation.

MS. PORTER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So he's waiving his right to a hearing on the restitution and he's agreeable to the Court ordering restitution in the sum of \$6,006?

MS. PORTER: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then with regard to sentencing, the Pre-Sentence Report had attached to it numerous letters and apparent requests by individuals that wish to speak at sentencing on behalf of the two victims. There was one letter, I note, that is apparently from an aunt with no name that the People are requesting to read and at this time, Mr. Dodd, how many family members are choosing to speak because the Court of Appeals has indicated that this Court has discretion with regard to allowing individuals to speak at sentencing or not and their language is that the Court in its discretion allowing more than one person to speak on behalf of the victims that the circumstances that the Court should consider in allowing persons to speak -- let me find their language because the Court of Appeals in this situation where individuals were not allowed to speak -- "in exercising its

discretion in making this determination, the Court must determine if the statements would be (inaudible) unhelpful, repetitive, inflammatory or otherwise inappropriate." And having read these letters, I find they are really not helpful to this Court with regard to sentencing to a large extent. They certainly are repetitive and they appeared, also, to be inflammatory. For some reason, victims wishing to speak at sentencing has gotten to the point now where it's not offering information to the Court relative to the sentence but it seems to be an attempt by the family members -- I'm not talking particularly about this case -- to come in and wish to degrade the Defendant and create an inflammatory atmosphere which this Court doesn't find to be helpful, so I don't know who wants to speak but, please, advise.

MR. DODD: Yes, sir. I can report this to the Court and this is as of my conversations last night and, also, this morning. Starting with the victim, Victoria Steen, I can report to the Court that I spoke with her natural mother, Ms. (inaudible) last night and also natural father, Rodney West, and there is no one that I am aware of, at this point, that wishes to address the Court

relative to Victoria Steen in terms of mother or father that I'm aware of.

Separate and distinct, Judge, as to Charles Carr, Jr., here in the Courtroom would be Charles Carr, Sr., father, and I believe Deborah, mother. In speaking with Mr. Carr, Sr., he's indicated to me, sir, that he did not wish to make any commentary to the Court on the issue of sentence. I believe that included within the information provided in the PSI, it was a request by an aunt.

THE COURT: No name. I don't even know who it is.

MR. DODD: I believe it is someone named Mrs. Donna Marsden and I can see that there's a Mrs. Marsden who is apparently here in Court, so on behalf of the deceased, Charles Carr, Judge, it would appear that there's a biological relative aunt, a Mrs. Donna Marsden. Those would be the only persons that I'm aware of that indicated that they wished to address the Court in terms of sentence.

THE COURT: The aunt wants to speak because the letter said she wanted the People to read her letter that was provided to the Court together with the Pre-Sentence Investigation. So does she want to speak or are you reading in her letter?

MR. DODD: Well, Judge, can I take one moment just to finalize that?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. DODD: Thank you. Judge, I can report this back to the Court. I've spoken just a moment ago with Ms. Marsden, Judge. There apparently has been a writing submitted to the Court in the form of a letter. She would rely upon the letter itself without the necessity of it being read in Court and, further, we would ask the Court to consider that as a factor amongst the factors that you will look at in terms of sentence. So I can report at this point there does not appear to be a family member, other than that which I've just said, that wishes to address the Court, sir, relative to aspect of sentence.

THE COURT: Okay, and there was attached to the Report, also, letters from other family members of Mr. Carr which have been made available to counsel and the Court has reviewed and the only reason I wanted this issue to be addressed is because they do appear there's -- oh, there's a letter signed by Donna Marsden but then there's, also, this other letter that asks the People -- it says, "Please read at sentencing by D.A. if

possible" wrote by an aunt, so the aunt is the other letter by Donna Marsden. Those are written or penned by the same individual.

MR. DODD: Yes, sir, that's my understanding.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. See, I didn't know.

I mean, I couldn't tell. And then there was, also, the Victim Impact Statements. I don't know who prepared this one. No name. So, apparently, all of the two letters that were received, they were both written by Donna Marsden. In addition, there's two Impact Statements, Victim Impact Statements and it's interesting because I really never noticed this before. They don't have a name on them. It says, "My firstborn child, a son, a junior, in fact.

Losing my firstborn has left an empty hole." So it's got to be by one of the parents. I guess it's the parent of Mr. Carr.

MR. DODD: Yes.

THE COURT: But there's no name or anything on them but --

MR. DODD: Yes.

THE COURT: -- I got the information that they both provided.

Did the People want to be heard on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

sentencing then, seeing none of the victims want to speak, is that correct?

MR. DODD: Yes, sir, Judge. I would move sentence and I would ask to be heard, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DODD: The Court has addressed the issue of restitution.

This is premeditated and calculating and the Court is aware that this started well before the date that he took the lives of two persons. February this Defendant threatened to kill Victoria. We know that from potential evidence that we discussed that could be admissible at time of trial. He put his hands around her throat, tightened his hands to the point of loss of consciousness. That gave rise to a charge filed against him back on February 28th of 2010 that resulted in his conviction when he pled guilty to that August 31. So his premeditation to cause her death extends well back in time and, on the day in question, Judge, clearly it would be my position to the Court he was motivated by anger and jealousy, anger towards her, jealousy of Charles, Jr.. This matter was calculated, designed. There were all sorts of opportunities for this man to elect not to shoot

someone. Evidence of that would be when he was stopped for the traffic charge, Judge, of speeding. He calculated and decided to do this and I think that the only appropriate sentence, obviously, is imprisonment.

It's going to be my recommendation to the Court that -- and you have two matters to sentence him upon.

THE COURT: Three.

MR. DODD: The two Murder, 2s and the Murder, 1, yes. It would be my position to the Court that you impose a sentence that will make sure that he's locked up for the rest of his life and I know the options would be a potential sentence of life imprisonment without parole as to Murder, First Degree.

Alternatively, Judge, as to each of the Murder 2s, it would be my specific recommendation you consider imposing a sentence of 25 years to life as to each to run consecutively, Judge.

Thank you very much, sir.

THE COURT: And you're, also, aware that in the event he's sentenced to life without parole, then he has -- those sentences have to run concurrent. They can't run consecutive.

MR. DODD: Yes. 1 THE COURT: I just want you to make sure 2 when --3 MR. DODD: If you do exercise that option, 4 5 yes. THE COURT: All right. Okay -- I forgot 6 7 your name. MS. PORTER: Ms. Porter. 8 THE COURT: Ms. Porter. First of all, are 9 there any errors in the Pre-Sentence Report? 10 MS. PORTER: No, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Okay, and did you want to be 12 heard relative to sentencing? 13 MS. PORTER: Yes. We mentioned to the Court 14 that the People do have the burden of establishing 15 the legality of a consecutive sentence. 16 Also, we would just like to state and 17 request that the Court take into consideration in 18 fashioning a sentence that the Defendant's acts, 19 although we don't contend they were right -- it is 20 clear that they were wrong -- but that they were 21 motivated out of a desire to protect his children. 22 THE COURT: Is that all? 23 MS. PORTER: That's it, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: How about you, Mr. Steen? 25

Anything you want to say?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Steen, obviously you're aware the jury did not find your defense that your actions were to protect your children had any validity to it because they found you guilty of the Murder, First Degree, and the Murder, Second Degree, in the last two counts of the Indictment and, frankly, this Court can understand that decision by the jury because we all know from the facts of this trial that apparently you were concerned with this child that was allowed by your ex-wife, estranged wife, to go to her oldest child's father. In any event, that residence was down in the Hastings/Brewerton area in the southern part of Oswego County and when you found out about this, and whether you found out about it the night before or that morning really doesn't make a lot of difference because when you did find out, if it was in the morning, then it was an immediate reaction on your part. If it was the night before, you had all night to think about it. In any event, you didn't go down to save the child and drive south where the child was but you drove all the way north to Pulaski and you took a shotgun with you and there doesn't appear

to be any question here about what you were going to do because you weren't saving the child because the child was miles south of where you were going and the direction you were heading and you certainly didn't need the shotgun to save the child.

This Pre-Sentence Report sets forth that you have always been in the Special Learning classes and you had a difficult childhood, apparently, because of your parents, the problems with their marriage and, interestingly enough, Mr. Dodd points out that you apparently threatened to kill your wife but the Report indicates there was a time when, I guess, you threatened to kill your mother, also, some years ago.

MS. PORTER: Your Honor, on the record, from my reading of the Pre-Sentence Report, I believe it stated his father had threatened to kill his mother.

THE COURT: You think that's what it says?

Because I read it a couple of times and I was trying to figure it out but the end result, I thought it was the Defendant here because it says, "The officer spoke to the Defendant's mother, Sheila Mifflin, by phone. She indicated that the Defendant had a very difficult childhood especially in relation to the divorce." So it's a good thing we clear this up

. -

because I would think Corrections may read it the same way. She said his father played a lot of head games with their boys. She also verified that the Defendant's claim that Mr. Steen -- the Defendant's claim, okay, so it's -- this is referring to Mr. -- the Defendant's father.

MS. PORTER: Yes. Earlier in the
Pre-Sentence Report it states the Defendant's claim
about his father making that threat.

THE COURT: All right. It's good that that's cleared up then. But, apparently, you had a lot of problems, Mr. Steen, and, obviously, you know, there were people attempting to help you. You were in Court at the time and there's no question here that this was a premeditated taking of two individuals' lives.

So upon your conviction, Mr. Steen, the Court is going to -- upon your conviction for Murder in the First Degree, which was the first count of the Indictment, I'm going to sentence you to a sentence of life without parole.

That's uncalled for.

And upon your conviction for Murder in the Second Degree in the fourth count of the Indictment, the Court is going to sentence you to 25 years to

life.

And upon your conviction of the fifth count for Murder in the Second Degree, similarly impose a sentence of 25 years to life, order restitution in the sum of \$6,006, recommend the Parole Board collect that from you, say, within 80 months. It will continue if it's not paid. There's also a \$50 DNA Fee the Court has to impose which should be collected from you within four months and the Court will waive the \$325 surcharge seeing it's ordering restitution.

Good luck, Mr. Steen.

(End of tape recording.)

I, Amy VanAlstyne, certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the Oswego County Court of People v. James H. Steen, Jr., Indictment #10C-0138, was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

amy benalttyne

428 County Route 10 Pennellville, NY 13132

April 23, 2012